Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Record

Regarding: OCA 86-3764

STAT

After talking with [redacted] I advised

STAT

Peter Lert on 13 November that [redacted] will participate in the workshop on 17-18 November. Lert will get in touch with [redacted] directly. Action completed.

STAT

STAT

[redacted]

Executive Officer

Date 14 November 1986

FORM 5-75 101 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC		X		
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OLL	X			
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	VC/NIC				
17	D/OSWR		X		
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
	SUSPENSE				

Date

Remarks To # 13: For coordination and direct response as to availability of

Executive Secretary
7 Nov 86
Date

3637 (10-81)

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS

Routing Slip

	ACTION	INFO
1. D/OCA		
2. DD/Legislation		
3. DD/Senate Affairs		
4. Ch/Senate Affairs		
5. DD/House Affairs		
6. Ch/House Affairs		
7. Admin Officer		
8. Executive Officer		
9. FOIA Officer		
10. Constituent Inquiries Officer		
11.		
12.		

SUSPENSE _____ Date

Action Officer:
Remarks:

_____
Name/Date

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

OLA FILE
RECPT #

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD
TED STEVENS, ALASKA, CHAIRMAN
MORRIS K. UDALL, ARIZONA, VICE CHAIRMAN
ORRIN G. HATCH, UTAH
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., MARYLAND
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, MASSACHUSETTS
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
CLAIBORNE PELL, RHODE ISLAND
GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., CALIFORNIA
JOHN D. DINGELL, MICHIGAN
CLARENCE E. MILLER, OHIO
COOPER EVANS, IOWA
DON SUNDQUIST, TENNESSEE
JOHN H. GIBBONS

JOHN H. GIBBONS
DIRECTOR

Congress of the United States
OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-8025

86-3764

November 4, 1986

Honorable David D. Gries
Director
Congressional Affairs
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, DC 20505

Dear Mr. Gries:

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) is organizing a Workshop entitled "Comparing U.S. and Soviet Military Technology: Tactical Avionics," to be held at OTA on November 17-18, 1986. This workshop is being conducted by our International Security and Commerce Program as an initial response to a request made by Congressman Les Aspin, Chairman, and Congressman William L. Dickenson, Ranking Minority Member, of the House Committee on Armed Services. The Committee has indicated that it is interested in obtaining a broad assessment comparing the military technologies of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. We are organizing the workshop both to address a particular area of technology, and to serve as a pilot study to assess the usefulness of a full-scale assessment. The level of classification of the meeting will be SECRET/NOFORN. The enclosed proposed outline indicates the objectives and issues to be addressed in the workshop. A report of the workshop proceedings will be produced, written at the level of classification of the meeting itself.

STAT
STAT

This letter is to request that [redacted] be available to participate in this workshop. In an informal discussion with [redacted] which followed the briefing given us last month at CIA Headquarters, we confirmed that his previous work with OSD on this subject as well as his current activities preparing NIE 11-12 would enable him to provide the workshop with unique and critical methodological insights, even though he is unable to discuss the substance of the NIE pending the completion of its coordination.

STAT

The personal and professional experience and perspective of [redacted] will be of great benefit to us in having a useful workshop, and in producing a balanced, authoritative, and objective workshop proceedings. The participants will be asked to review the workshop proceedings in draft. The proceedings will list the participants, but will not attribute views to specific participants. Participation in the workshop will not require and does not imply agreement with, or endorsement of, the findings of the proceedings. OTA, not the workshop participants, assumes responsibility for the contents of the workshop proceedings.

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Because time is short, your prompt attention to this matter would be appreciated. The staff contact for further information is Dr. Peter Lert, at (202) 226-2015.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Sharfman
Program Manager
International Security and Commerce Program

STAT

cc:

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

PROPOSED WORKSHOP OUTLINE

COMPARING U.S. AND SOVIET MILITARY TECHNOLOGY:
TACTICAL AVIONICS

Classification level: SECRET/NOFORN

Objectives

- Obtain a preliminary assessment of the relative capabilities of the Soviet Union and the U.S. in tactical avionics, with emphasis on air interceptor radar.
  -- Identify areas of consensus, and controversy, concerning Soviet and U.S. capabilities (taken independently).
  -- Compare technology capabilities in areas of consensus and controversy.
  -- Identify major areas of uncertainty in the comparison of capabilities, and assess the reliability of the comparison.

- Estimate the plausible contribution that *could* be made by a broader OTA assessment effort.
  -- Identify a range of objectives for the assessment.
  -- Estimate likelihood of achieving objectives.
  -- Rank the objectives according to their value to the Congress.
  -- Identify criteria by which areas of technology should be chosen in order to maximize value of study.

Issues to be Addressed

- Methodology of comparative technology assessment
  -- How can time phasing of technology development and application be accounted for in a way that produces useful results? Should the 'average of fielded systems' be compared? If so, what average (1980? now? 1990? later?) ? Or is it more useful to compare contemporaneous capabilities (e.g. avionics systems with similar IOC's) ?
  -- What is the best or most appropriate level of aggregation at which to compare technology? Avionics can be studied at the system level (e.g. fire control radar), component level (e.g. signal processor), or even enabling technology level (e.g. microprocessor, integrated circuit design and fabrication). Also, avionics systems are themselves components of weapons systems (air interceptors), which are part of the force structures that would actually engage in warfare.
  -- What is the best approach to technology comparison and assessment for military systems in the Congressional context? Should we focus on general areas of technology (data processing), or on weapons systems (e.g. F-15 vs. MiG-31), or on the relative strengths and weaknesses of opposing technologies (e.g. radars vs. ECM systems)?

- Significance to the Congress
  -- What are the key areas of military technology? How can they be identified?
  -- Where along the process of research, development and acquisition is technology comparison of most use to the Congress? Comparisons could be made for technologies in basic

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5

research, applied research, engineering development, full scale development, and in the field.

-- What areas of potential utility to Congress of the comparative assessment of military technology should be emphasized? For example, is it more useful to focus on opportunities for progress in specific technology areas, or on service laboratory management or OSD research and engineering management?

- Knowledge of Soviet technology capabilities
  -- How well do we know about Soviet technological capabilities? Can we even address that question meaningfully at this level of classification?
  -- With what confidence do we know about Soviet technologies?
  -- How can the limits of our knowledge be taken into account in considering legislative alternatives?
  -- How well can we 'extrapolate' from U.S. technology processes and developments to gain insight into Soviet technology? To what extent do the Soviets mirror the U.S.?

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/11/09 : CIA-RDP90B01390R000300350004-5